



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/753,860

01/07/2004

Craig D. Cuttner

12510/31

6021

7590
KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004

06/07/2011

EXAMINER

HONG, HYUN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2426

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/07/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/753,860	Applicant(s) CUTTNER ET AL.	
	Examiner HYUN HONG	Art Unit 2426	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-24 and 26-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-24 and 26-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed on 04/16/10. Claims 1, 3-24, 26-36 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/16/10 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4-8, 12-17, 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of Needham US 2003/0177495) in view of Feinberg (US 2002/0078440).

Regarding claim 1, Ellis discloses A method for displaying a media guide to a user, comprising:

receiving information regarding media programs which include: i) programs that are immediately available to the user via download or data streaming ([0043] via internet), and iii) programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast (via cable link [0043]), the information including titles of the media programs; and ([0006] Television broadcasts are comprised of streaming data.)

list of recommended titles (fig. 16b)

Ellis does not specifically disclose receiving information regarding ii) programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, displaying in a single integrated list of titles at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming, a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and a title of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast.

However, Needham discloses receiving information regarding ii) programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user ([0019, 0023]) displaying in a single integrated list of titles at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming ([0025], fig. 1), a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user ([0019, 0023], fig. 1), and a title

of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast ([0014], fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to combine the single integrated list of Needham into the program guide of Ellis. This provides the user with a more comprehensive program guide that informs the user of recorded programs in addition to other programs.

Ellis in view of Needham does not specifically disclose filtering the programs.

However, Feinberg discloses filtering the programs ([0049]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the filtering of Feinberg into the program guide of Ellis in view of Needham in order to separate the various programs for display.

Regarding claim 3, Ellis discloses wherein the locally stored media programs include programs that are stored on a personal video recorder ([0056]).

Regarding claim 4, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, wherein available to the user via television broadcast include programs that are available to the user via at least one of: i) satellite broadcast, and ii) cable broadcast ([0006] “cable system headends” “satellite TV distribution”).

Regarding claim 5, Ellis discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the information includes data which describes content of the media programs, and wherein the method further comprises: comparing the data that describes the content of the media programs to data that describes user preferences, wherein the displaying step includes displaying the titles based on a result of the comparison ([0095]).

Regarding claim 6, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 5, further comprising: receiving the user preferences expressly from the user ([0085]).

Regarding claim 7, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 6, further comprising: determining the user preferences based on a viewing history of the user ([0010]).

Regarding claim 8, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 6, wherein the displaying step includes displaying titles of media programs that do not meet the user preferences and that meet a promotional priority of a service provider (fig 6 “selectable advertisement, [0066]).

Regarding claim 12, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, wherein the media programs further include media programs that are available to the user in the future (fig. 7 *Future times are listed on the media guide*).

Regarding claim 13, Ellis discloses the method according to claim 1.

However, Ellis does not disclose wherein the titles are displayed with a graphical indication of availability of the media programs.

In analogous art, Needham discloses wherein the titles are displayed with a graphical indication of availability of the media programs ([0025] “colors, icons”).

It would have been obvious to combine the graphical indication of Needham into the media guide of Ellis. This makes it easier for the user to see the programs that are unavailable/available.

Regarding claim 14, Ellis in view of Needham discloses The method according to claim 13, wherein the graphical indication includes at least one of color shading and an icon ([0025] of Needham).

Regarding claim 15, Ellis does not disclose wherein the media programs include media programs that are available to the user in the future and programs that are stored locally, and wherein the graphical indication describes whether the media programs are one of immediately available for download or data streaming, immediately available via television broadcast, stored locally, and available in the future.

However, Needham discloses wherein the media programs include media programs that are available to the user in the future and programs that are stored locally, and wherein the graphical indication describes whether the media programs are one of immediately available for download or data streaming, immediately available via television broadcast, stored locally, and available in the future ([0025] of Needham). It would have been obvious to combine the graphical indication of Needham into the media guide of Ellis. This makes it easier for the user to see the programs that are unavailable/available.

Regarding claim 16, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, recording a television broadcast ([0048]).

Regarding claim 17, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, providing a media program via one of download and data streaming ([0006]).

Regarding claim 24, Ellis discloses a system, comprising:

A processor (42 of Ellis control circuitry);

At least one arrangement configured to communicate with the processor via a communications network (fig. 2b, fig. 4 of Ellis);

A computer-readable storing medium (memory 63, [0062] of Ellis) storing a set of instructions, the set of instructions capable of being executed by the processor to implement a method for displaying a media guide to a user, the set of instructions performing the steps of:

receiving information regarding media programs which include: i) programs that are immediately available to the user via download or data streaming ([0043] of Ellis via internet), and iii) programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast (via cable link [0043] of Ellis), the information including titles of the media programs; and ([0006] of Ellis Television broadcasts are comprised of streaming data.)

Ellis does not specifically disclose listing programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and displaying, in a single integrated list of recommended titles, at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming, a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and a title of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast.

However, Needham discloses listing programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and displaying, in a single integrated list of recommended

Art Unit: 2426

titles, at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming, a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and a title of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast ([0019, 0023] of Needham). It would have been obvious to combine the single integrated list of Needham into the program guide of Ellis. This provides the user with a more comprehensive program guide that informs the user of recorded programs in addition to other programs.

Ellis in view of Needham does not specifically disclose filtering the programs.

However, Feinberg discloses filtering the programs ([0049]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the filtering of Feinberg into the program guide of Ellis in view of Needham in order to separate the various programs for display.

Regarding claim 26, see the rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claim 28, see the rejection of claim 14.

Regarding claim 29, see the rejection of claim 17.

Regarding claim 34, Ellis discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein all of the programs whose titles are included in the single integrated list of recommended titles are selected for inclusion of their titles in the single integrated list in accordance with at least one of promotional priorities, user program preferences, and user program experience history (fig. 16a-b of Ellis).

Regarding claim 35, see the rejection of claim 34.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of Needham US 2003/0177495) as applied to claim 1 and claim 24 respectively, further in view of Colsey (US 2003/005429).

Regarding claim 9, Ellis in view of Needham does not teach in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying a preview of a media program associated with the selected title.

However, Colsey discloses in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying a preview of a media program associated with the selected title ([0026]).

It would have been obvious to combine the previews of Colsey into the media guide of Ellis in view of Needham. This would allow users to quickly determine whether they want to watch a specific program.

Regarding claim 10, Ellis in view of Needham does not disclose generating the preview based on flags transmitted from a central facility.

However, Colsey discloses generating the preview based on flags transmitted from a central facility ([0026] of Colsey) *The preview is stored and released by the EPG server.*) It would have been obvious to combine the previews of Colsey into the media guide of Ellis in view of Needham. This would allow users to quickly determine whether they want to watch a specific program.

Regarding claim 11, Ellis in view of Needham does not disclose receiving the preview with the media program associated with the selected title.

However, Colsey discloses receiving the preview with the media program associated with the selected title ([0026] of Colsey). It would have been obvious to combine the previews of Colsey into the media guide of Ellis in view of Needham. This would allow users to quickly determine whether they want to watch a specific program.

Regarding claim 27, see the rejection of claim 9.

Claims 18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of Needham US 2003/0177495) as applied to claim 1, further in view of Schein (US 2003/0005445).

Regarding claim 18, Ellis in view of Needham does not disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying information related to the selected media program, the information includes at least one of actor data, director data and genre data.

In analogous art, Schein discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying information related to the selected media program, the information includes at least one of actor data, director data and genre data (fig. 18E).

It would have been obvious to combine the actor data of Shein into the media guide of Ellis in view of Needham. This enables the user to find out information about his favorite programs.

Regarding claim 19, Ellis in view of Needham does not disclose prompting the user to at least one of pay a cost and wait a time period before viewing a media program.

However, Schein discloses prompting the user to at least one of pay a cost and wait a time period before viewing a media program (fig. 18c of Schein). It would have been obvious to combine the actor data of Shein into the media guide of Ellis in view of Needham. This enables the user to find out information about his favorite programs.

Claims 20-23, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks (US 6,515,680) in view of Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of Feinberg (US 2002/0078440).

Regarding claim 20, Hendricks discloses a method of displaying a program guide to a user, comprising:

a) receiving information from a programming provider that indicates suggested media programs (fig. 16-17)

c) displaying, in a first list, titles of at least some of the suggested media programs (fig. 16-17)

Hendricks does not specifically disclose b) receiving express user references from the user; d) displaying in a second list, titles of at least some media programs that are immediately available to the user and that meet at least one of the user preferences, displaying a first and second list on a single page, a separation of the first and second lists being demarcated.

However, Ellis discloses b) receiving express user references from the user ([0085]); d) displaying in a second list, titles of at least some media programs that are immediately available to the user and that meet at least one of the user preferences (fig. 16a, [0095]), displaying a first and second list on a single page, a separation of the first and second lists being demarcated (fig. 16a , [0066]) *The selectable advertisements can be used to promote the pay per view programs of Hendricks. These two selectable advertisements represent the second list*). It would have been obvious to combine the user preference system of Ellis into the program guide of Hendricks. This would allow the provider to customize the EPG according to the user's preferences.

Hendricks in view of Ellis does not specifically disclose display a single filter bar including a plurality of filter-specification buttons, wherein, for each of the buttons, selection of the button causes a respective type of filtering of both of the first and second lists.

Feinberg discloses display a single filter bar including a plurality of filter-specification buttons, wherein, for each of the buttons, selection of the button causes a respective type of filtering of both of the first and second lists ([0049]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the

filtering of Feinberg into the program guide of Ellis in view of Needham in order to separate the various programs for display.

Regarding claim 21, Hendricks does not specifically disclose receiving metadata associated with at least some media programs, the metadata including information that describes the media programs, wherein step d) includes comparing the metadata to the express user preferences, and displaying titles of media programs based on the comparison.

However, Ellis discloses receiving metadata associated with at least some media programs, the metadata including information that describes the media programs, wherein step d) includes comparing the metadata to the express user preferences, and displaying titles of media programs based on the comparison ([0095] of Ellis). It would have been obvious to combine the user preference system of Ellis into the program guide of Hendricks. This would allow the provider to customize the EPG according to the user's preferences.

Regarding claim 22, see claim 8.

Regarding claim 23, Hendricks discloses a respective indication of a priority of a programming provider, based on the respective indications of a priority, selecting for inclusion in a list (fig. 16-17 of Hendricks);

Hendricks does not specifically disclose receiving user preferences;

Receiving titles of, and respective metadata associated with available media programs; comparing the user preferences to the metadata;

displaying on a single page and in a first list, a first title of at least one of the available media programs if the respective metadata associated with the at least one of the available media programs matches at least one of the user preferences; and

displaying on a single page and in a first list, a second title of at least another of the available media programs based on the priority of the programming provider, even if the respective metadata associated with the at least another of the available media programs does not match at least one of the user preferences.

However, Ellis discloses receiving user preferences ([0085] of Ellis);
receiving respective metadata associated with available media programs;
comparing the user preferences to the metadata ([0094] of Ellis); and

displaying on a single page (fig. 16a of Ellis) and in a first list, a first title of at least one of the available media programs if the respective metadata associated with the at least one of the available media programs matches at least one of the user preferences ([0094] of Ellis); and

displaying on a single page (fig. 16a of Ellis) and in a first list, a second title of at least another of the available media programs based on the priority of the programming provider, even if the respective metadata associated with the at least another of the available media programs does not match at least one of the user preferences (fig. 16a of Ellis). It would have been obvious to combine the user preference system of Ellis into the program guide of Hendricks. This would allow the provider to customize the EPG according to the user's preferences.

Regarding claim 30, see the rejection of claim 20.

Regarding claim 31, see the rejection of claim 21.

Regarding claim 32, see the rejection of claim 8.

Regarding claim 33, see the rejection of claim 23.

Claims 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of Needham US 2003/0177495) in view of Broadus (US 2002/0144264) in view of Feinberg (US 2002/0078440).

Regarding claim 36, Ellis discloses a method for displaying a media guide to a user, comprising:

In accordance with user input:

Receiving media programs via at least one receiving device (fig. 3);

Storing, locally relative to the user on a recordation device, the received media programs ([0054]);

Subsequent to the storing, receiving information regarding media programs which include i) programs that are immediately available to the user via at least one of download, data streaming, and television broadcast to the at least one receiving device ([0043]).

Ellis does not specifically disclose ii) the programs that have been previously stored locally on the recordation device; and subsequent to, and in accordance with the receiving information step, displaying, in a single integrated list of recommended titles, at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a respective title of

Art Unit: 2426

each of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via at least one of download, data streaming, and television broadcast, and a respective title of each of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally on the recordation device.

However, Needham discloses ii) the programs that have been previously stored locally on the recordation device; and subsequent to, and in accordance with the receiving information step, displaying, in a single integrated list of recommended titles, at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a respective title of each of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via at least one of download, data streaming, and television broadcast, and a respective title of each of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally on the recordation device ([0019, 0023, 0025], fig. 1). It would have been obvious to combine the single integrated list of Needham into the program guide of Ellis. This provides the user with a more comprehensive program guide that informs the user of recorded programs in addition to other programs.

Ellis in view of Needham does not disclose wherein the displaying includes displaying each of the respective titles of the at least one of the programs that have been previously stored with a respective icon indicating that the program has been locally recorded.

However, Broadus discloses wherein the displaying includes displaying each of the respective titles of the at least one of the programs that have been previously stored with a respective icon indicating that the program has been locally recorded (fig. 5). It

Art Unit: 2426

would have been obvious to combine the recording icon of Broadus into the EPG of Ellis in view of Needham. This would allow the user to easily see any previously recorded programs on an EPG.

Ellis in view of Needham does not specifically disclose filtering the programs.

However, Feinberg discloses filtering the programs ([0049]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the filtering of Feinberg into the program guide of Ellis in view of Needham in order to separate the various programs for display.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments:

Moreover, even if Needham et al. has disclosed that its EPG listing includes previously recorded programs (which it plainly does not), since the EPG listing of Needham et al. is not of recommended titles, the resulting listing would still not disclose or suggest the integrated list of recommended titles of claim 1, nor would there be any suggestion to modify a list of recommended titles to include titles of previously recorded programs. In this regard, a list of recommended titles is generated to limit the listings to only those which are recommended. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified such a limited list to be expanded to include listings of previously recorded programs because characteristics of recorded programs are conventionally thought to be known to the user since they are already "owned" and previously selected programs, and thus one would not have thought there to be any need for them to be further recommended.

Arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

In response to applicant's arguments:

The Advisory Action refers to figures 16 and 17 of Hendricks et al. as assertedly disclosing display of an advertisement based on a programming provider's priority and to the modification of the selectable advertisement of figure 16b of Ellis et al. to include the advertisement of Hendricks et al. as assertedly disclosing the second list. However, for example, paragraph 110 of Ellis et al. states that user preferences may be used to target the

Art Unit: 2426

advertisements. Neither reference suggests displaying an advertisement selected based on a provider's preference in the same page as one displaying a list of titles filtered based on user preference, even in an instance where the advertisement does not match the user preferences, as required by claim 23.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hendricks discloses that a list of hit movies is displayed to the user (fig. 16). More specifically, the movie "Terminator" is displayed to the user (fig. 17) in a promotional advertisement. The mere fact that the "Terminator" ad is displayed to the user is an indication that the movie is at least somewhat of a priority to the programming provider.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 3-24, 26-36 are rejected.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HYUN HONG whose telephone number is (571)270-1553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30a-7:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hirl can be reached on (571)272-3685. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2426

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 2426

/HAI TRAN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2426